

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
TUESDAY, AUGUST 20, 2002
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

S097444

E025710 Fourth Appellate District,
E025832 Division Two
E026853
E025710

WILSON v. PARKER, COVERT & CHIDESTER

Time extended to consider modification or rehearing

The time for granting or denying a rehearing is extended to and including November 13, 2002, or the date upon which a rehearing is either granted or denied, whichever comes first.

S107960

H024536 Sixth Appellate District

BALDINI (REGINA MARIA) ON H.C.

Time extended to grant or deny review

to and including September 27, 2002.

S108041

A098817 First Appellate District,
Division Five

FAULKENBERRY (DAVID LAWRENCE) ON H.C.

Time extended to grant or deny review

to and including October 1, 2002.

S108121

H024552 Sixth Appellate District

ABDULRAFI (MOHAMMAD JAVAID) ON H.C.

Time extended to grant or deny review

to and including October 4, 2002.

S012945

PEOPLE v. DAVIS (STANLEY BERNARD)

Extension of time granted

to 10-17-2002 to file appellant's reply brief. After that date, no further extension is contemplated. Extension is granted based upon Deputy State Public Defender Eggers's representation that she anticipates filing the reply brief by 10-17-2002.

S025519

PEOPLE v. DICKEY (COLIN R.)

Extension of time granted

to 9-18-2002 to file appellant's reply brief. After that date, no further extension will be granted. Extension is granted based upon counsel Haworth's representation that he anticipates filing the brief by 9-18-2002.

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
TUESDAY, AUGUST 20, 2002
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

S033149

PEOPLE v. WEAVER (LATWON R.)
Extension of time granted

to 10-22-2002 to file appellant's opening brief. The court anticipates that after that date, only four further extensions totaling 240 additional days will be granted. Counsel is ordered to inform his or her assisting attorney or entity, if any, and any assisting attorney or entity of any separate counsel of record, of this schedule, and to take all steps necessary to meet it.

S037195

PEOPLE v. KENNEDY (JERRY N.)
Extension of time granted

to 10-25-2002 to file reply brief. The court anticipates that after that date, only two further extensions totaling 90 additional days will be granted. Counsel is ordered to inform his or her assisting attorney or entity, if any, and any assisting attorney or entity of any separate counsel of record, of this schedule, and to take all steps necessary to meet it.

S038499

PEOPLE v. BELL (STEVEN M.)
Extension of time granted

to 10-21-2002 to file appellant's opening brief. The court anticipates that after that date, only one further extension totaling 63 additional days will be granted. Counsel is ordered to inform his or her assisting attorney or entity, if any, and any assisting attorney or entity of any separate counsel of record, of this schedule, and to take all steps necessary to meet this schedule.

S062770

PEOPLE v. BERGMAN (LAWRENCE E.)
Extension of time granted

to 10-21-2002 to file appellant's opening brief. The court anticipates that after that

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
TUESDAY, AUGUST 20, 2002
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

date, only four further extensions totaling 238 additional days will be granted. Counsel is ordered to inform his or her assisting attorney or entity, if any, and any assisting attorney or entity of any separate counsel of record, of this schedule, and to take all steps necessary to meet this schedule.

S104157

G026525 Fourth Appellate District,
Division Three

HAMEID v. NATIONAL FIRE INSURANCE
Extension of time granted

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file a consolidated answer brief in response to the amicus briefs filed on behalf of respondent is extended to and including August 23, 2002.

S107318

A095890 First Appellate District,
Division Three

PEOPLE v. BOWERS
Counsel appointment order filed

First District Appellate Project to represent appellant.

S107720

H021985 Sixth Appellate District

PEOPLE v. DELEON
Counsel appointment order filed

Catherine White is hereby appointed to represent appellant on his appeal now pending before this court.

S102062

OPPENHEIM ON DISCIPLINE
Order filed

Having been notified by the State Bar that John Morris Oppenheim, State Bar # 67038, was deceased as of September 13, 2001, the order of discipline filed on January 17, 2002, is vacated nunc pro tunc.

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
TUESDAY, AUGUST 20, 2002
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

S107295

FRANKLIN ON DISCIPLINE
Recommended discipline imposed

It is ordered that SIDNEY FRANKLIN, JR., State Bar No. 37135, be suspended from the practice of law for six months, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for one year subject to the conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed on January 16, 2002, as modified by its order filed February 27, 2002. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar and one-half of said costs shall be added to and become part of the membership fees for the years 2003 and 2004. (Business & Professions Code section 6086.10.)

S107298

KING ON DISCIPLINE
Recommended discipline imposed

2 years suspension stayed, and that he be actually suspended for 90 days and until the State Bar Court grants a motion to terminate his actual suspension pursuant to rule 205 of the Rules of Procedure of the State Bar of California, as recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its decision filed on February 6, 2002. Respondent is also ordered to comply with the conditions of probation, if any, hereinafter imposed by the State Bar Court as a condition for terminating his actual suspension. If respondent is actually suspended for two years or more, he shall remain actually suspended until he provides proof to the satisfaction of the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
TUESDAY, AUGUST 20, 2002
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii) of the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct. It is further ordered that respondent take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order or during the period of his actual suspension, whichever is longer. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) It is further ordered that respondent comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.* Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6140.7.

S107390

**BRACHFELD ON DISCIPLINE
Recommended discipline imposed**

It is ordered that MARTIN BRACHFELD, State Bar No. 81548, be suspended from the practice of law for three months, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for one year subject to the conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed on January 10, 2002, as modified by its order filed February 27, 2002. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6140.7.

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
TUESDAY, AUGUST 20, 2002
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

S107399

DICKERSON ON DISCIPLINE

It is ordered that CHARLES E. DICKERSON III, State Bar No. 92590, be suspended from the practice of law for four years and until he has shown proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for five years on condition that he be actually suspended for 18 months and until he has shown proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct. Respondent is further ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed on January 16, 2002, as modified by its order filed February 27, 2002. It is also ordered that respondent take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination during the period of his actual suspension. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Respondent is further ordered to comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.* Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6140.7.

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
TUESDAY, AUGUST 20, 2002
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

S107405

PEEPLES ON DISCIPLINE
Recommended discipline imposed

It is ordered that H. E. CHRISTIAN PEEPLES, State Bar No. 83928, be suspended from the practice of law for one year, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for two years on condition that he be actually suspended for 60 days. H. E. Christian Peeples is also ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order Approving Stipulation filed April 4, 2002. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See Segretti v. State Bar (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar and one-half of said costs shall added to and become part of the membership fees for the years 2003 and 2004. (Bus. & Prof. Code section 6086.10.)

S108774

MUSTAFA, RESIGNATION OF
Resignation accepted with disciplinary proceeding pending.

S108963

SHERMAN ON RESIGNATION
Resignation accepted with disciplinary proceeding pending.